

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.17093 of 2009
Date of Decision.06.04.2010

Mukesh Kumar Verma, resident of House No.3157, 1st Floor, Sector
37-D, Chandigarh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Chief Information Commissioner, State Information Commission,
Haryana, SCO 114-115, Sector 8-C, Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

Present: Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, petitioner in person.

None for the respondents.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

K. KANNAN J.(ORAL)

1. The complaint of the petitioner in the writ petition is that the information that he had sought with the Haryana Staff Selection Commission regarding some details relating to the A-Class Naib Tehsildars had not been provided and for non-compliance of the directions issued by the State Information Commission, he had made a complaint, upon which show cause notice had been issued under Section 20 of the Right to Information Act. Reply had been given, which was accepted and ultimately the action was dropped.

2. The petitioner's grievance is that the Commission has allowed its own order to be flouted that the information which was directed to be issued to the petitioner free of cost has not come to

any fruition till date. An explanation that had been given in response to the show cause notice against imposition of penalty could not have been acceded by the Commission without ensuring that the direction that it had already given had been fully complied with. It is not merely a situation of some person explaining why he did not furnish the information within time but it is a case where no information at all has been furnished in spite of orders. The withdrawal of the show cause notice through the impugned order dated 08.07.2009 is quashed and the matter is remitted to the State Information Commission directing them to pass appropriate orders and ensure that the information that was sought by the petitioner is given to him without any further letter for delay.

3. The writ petition is disposed of on the above terms.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

April 06, 2010
Pankaj*